

**DRAFT**  
**DEFT Meeting Notes**  
**11/5/98**  
**1:00-5:00 pm**

**Participants**

Elise Holland, Bruce Herbold, Peter Rhoads, Pete Chadwick, Mike Fris, Jim White, Karl Halupka, Curtis Creel, Peter Louie, Paul Fujitani, Matt Vandenberg, Dale Sweetnam, Larry Brown, Joe Miyamoto, Serge Birk, Tom Cannon, Russ Brown, Ron Ott

**Agenda**

Develop rules for scenarios.

**Highlites and Actions:**

- basic rules for scenarios were developed
- instructions for modeling scenarios were developed
- issues listed

**Scenario A: (see table for details)**

1. Bruce: when stating wet/dry year type, we are referring to designation by operations at specific times of the year, not our normal wet-dry year designations.
2. Summer striped bass protect provided by In-Delta AFRP (July-August).
3. Bruce: QWEST is proposed because it provides necessary cues - weighs more on San Joaquin flows than E/I.  $QWEST = \text{Cross Delta flow} + \text{San Joaquin flow} - \text{exports} + \text{rain in Delta}$ .
4. Pete R: do you need to curtail exports to protect San Joaquin salmon fry - why not cut predators and improve habitat rather than lose water supply?
5. Mike F: the 14 days specified for export reductions may not be enough to provide protection.
6. Pete R: suggests probing issues for each scenario as we go, then summarize. He has no problem looking at these actions in an adaptive management framework in Stage 1, but he does in this fixed standards framework of scenario A.

**Scenario B: (see table)**

7. Elise: B sets some standards and some flex ops based on priorities.
8. Two types of B were developed: 1) proportional application of EWA across the target species and seasons, or 2) by priority.
9. Ron: what we are more assure of could go into type 2.
10. Dale S: concerned that type 2 would short end of year targets.
11. Serge: likes type 2 because we need to push env to get response from our limited budget each year. We should set priorities based on Adaptive management. Would rather see water go to one good experiment then spread thinly over many.

12. Bruce: Scenarios build from A to E with flex rules around blocks of water.
13. Pete C: we should present both types.
14. Mike F: we need sensitivity analyses to show how the rules work under both types.

#### **Scenario C (see table)**

15. Bruce: we only have about 180 TAF from relaxing E/I to play with in EWA.
16. Pete C: allocation should be at discretion of Eco Manager.
17. Mike F: given this why do we have to describe now how we might use water?
18. Bruce: to show how assurances might be provided, and for modeling.
19. Mike F: how do we show benefits and contrasts between C and A and B?
20. Pete C: you don't get the water in C until year 7, whereas you get it one day 1 in A.
21. Elise: doesn't see why we have to define how to use env water now.
22. Bruce: need to define volume of water. If volume is similar to A, then C should provide greater assurances than A.
23. Karl: we should define some population triggers
24. Pete C: for San Joaquin salmon - use run size: if > 50,000 then they are low priority; if < 5,000 then high priority. Multiple dry years may increase priority.
25. Serge: there is high variability in adult escapement estimates. Could use juvenile productions index from screw traps. Interceptor habitat will make a difference.
26. Dale S: reluctant to use fall midwater trawl index for delta smelt trigger priority - though if index is very low you may want to set priority higher.
27. Pete C: we may want to have tech teams set these priorities.
28. Karl: some species may require short term actions, while others may need multiannual triggers - different time horizons.
29. Pete C: yes, for fall salmon protections you have to have carryover credits.
30. Pete R: wants to go on record that there is no consensus on some of these features: striped bass protections for example.
31. Bruce: two types of use - two checkbooks
32. Pete C: criteria for setting priorities are needed.

#### **Scenario D**

33. Bruce: fundamental difference in how you get water into EWA.
34. Pete C: here we have to allocate water for in-Delta AFRP first.
35. Pete C: D keeps E/I standards - Eco Manager can relax based on triggers as in C.
36. Bruce: for model purposes we should assume E/I dropped.
37. Ron: we need rules for relaxing E/I's.

#### **Scenario E (see table)**

38. Rules for modelling:
  - No of days to reduce salvage by: 20% and 50%
  - for adult delta smelt, young delta smelt, Sac salmon fry and smolts, SanJ salmon fry and smolts
  - other species covered by these rules.

Russ will model.

### **Instructions for Modelers**

39. Pete C:/Bruce: need rules for relaxing standards in A and in D.
40. Bruce: need same baseline for all model runs.
41. Mike F: need to see incremental effects of each element in A.
42. Elise: In D we have to generate water with Eco Manager relaxations. - assume full relax

Scenario A: put in all four actions - calc extreme water cost. (1) with noname tools and (2) without NoName tools

Scenario B: same as for A.

Scenario C: (1) full relax E/I and full pumping only ; (2) full relax and all NNG tools; baseline = Accord + all AFRP - E/I

Scenario D: (1) same as C; (2) run C with accord + upstream AFRP to compare to this base

Scenario E: run (1) 20% salvage reduction; (2) 50% salvage reduction.

### **Additional Comments**

43. Mike F: worries about how people will percieve model output effects on water supply - will these numbers be realistic.

### **Issues (see attached list)**

44. Bruce: group into those we addressed by may disagree and those not addressed.
45. Jim W: only time will tell on some of the issues.
46. Bruce: all of our scenarios are entrainment based: do we want a habitat scenario? In C we could spend water to finance habitat.
47. Pete R: if habitat is successful at achieving recovery, then we conclude that exports are simply reflecting overall abundance and have no effect on overall abundance.
48. Elise: habitat is good we all agree - we differ in whether we think benefits will come quickly and whether they offset entrainment effects.
49. Serge: If we see upstream benefits, can we relax downstream restrictions on exports?
50. Pete R: we may agree on habitat actions, but not the benefits of habitat actions.
51. Ron: we agree on the issues, but not the importance.
52. Karl: Scenario A has opportunities for Adaptive management in the options for relaxation. We haven't dealt with this flexibility, nor the opportunity to do Adaptive management.
53. Pete C: lets not forget that we all agreed that the isolated facilities alternative is superior to this approach.
54. Karl: need new names for scenarios - letters don't help id.

**Schedule: model runs by tues.**